## APPEAL NO. 022051 FILED SEPTEMBER 17, 2002

This appeal arises pursuant to the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, TEX. LAB. CODE ANN. § 401.001 *et seq.* (1989 Act). A contested case hearing was held on July 11, 2002. The hearing officer determined that the appellant (claimant) is not entitled to supplemental income benefits (SIBs) for the third quarter. The claimant appeals, asserting that his evidence showed that he had no ability to work during the qualifying period for the third quarter. The respondent (carrier) responds, arguing that the claimant's appeal is untimely, but otherwise urges affirmance

## **DECISION**

Affirmed.

As to the carrier's assertion that the claimant's appeal is untimely, we refer the carrier to Section 410.202(d), amended effective June 17, 2001, to provide that Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays listed in Section 662.003, Texas Government Code, are not included in the computation of time in which a request for an appeal must be filed. The assertion of untimeliness is without merit.

We have reviewed the complained-of determinations and find that the hearing officer's Decision and Order is supported by sufficient evidence to be affirmed. Whether or not the claimant is entitled to SIBs for the third quarter presented a question of fact for the hearing officer. The hearing officer is the sole judge of the weight and credibility of the evidence. Section 410.165(a); <a href="Texas Employers Ins. Ass'n v. Campos">Texas Employers Ins. Ass'n v. Campos</a>, 666 S.W.2d 286 (Tex. App.-Houston [14th Dist.] 1984, no writ). There was conflicting evidence presented on the disputed issue. It was for the hearing officer, as the trier of fact, to resolve the conflicts and inconsistencies in the evidence and to determine what facts had been established. <a href="Garza v. Commercial Ins. Co.">Garza v. Commercial Ins. Co.</a>, 508 S.W.2d 701 (Tex. Civ. App.-Amarillo 1974, no writ). Nothing in our review of the record reveals that the hearing officer's determination is so contrary to the great weight and preponderance of the evidence as to be clearly wrong or manifestly unjust. As such, no sound basis exists for us to reverse that determination on appeal. <a href="Cain v. Bain">Cain v. Bain</a>, 709 S.W.2d 175, 176 (Tex. 1986).

The hearing officer's decision and order is affirmed.

The true corporate name of the insurance carrier is **HARTFORD UNDERWRITERS INSURANCE COMPANY** and the name and address of its registered agent for service of process is

CT CORPORATION SYSTEM 350 N. ST. PAUL STREET DALLAS, TEXAS 75201.

	Michael B. McShane Appeals Judge
CONCUR:	
Gary L. Kilgore Appeals Judge	
Appeals suage	
Robert W. Potts	
Appeals Judge	